THE MATHEMATICAL FOUNDATION

Homotopy Type Theory and the Relational Ontology of
The Self-Experiencing Universe

An explanatory note on methodology
for readers of the VCP simulation series

Waldemar Lis — March 2026
archive.org/@not_foryou

Why This Document Exists

The Vector Consciousness Prediction (VCP) simulation series — published at archive.org across multiple reports — produces numerical results from empirical literature and interprets them through a relational ontology. Readers occasionally ask: what is the mathematical foundation beneath this framework? Why does relational ontology need a special mathematics at all? Could it not simply use ordinary calculus, statistics, or set theory?

This document answers those questions. It is not a technical manual. It is an explanation — written for a careful general reader — of why a specific branch of mathematics called Homotopy Type Theory (HoTT) was chosen as the formal language of this project, what that mathematics says about the nature of identity and structure, and why those things matter for a framework that tries to measure the geometry of relational configurations rather than the properties of substances.

No prior knowledge of mathematics beyond basic algebra is assumed. Where formal notation would be required for precision, it is replaced here with careful prose. Readers who want the formal version are directed to the technical simulation reports.

Part One: The Problem That Ordinary Mathematics Cannot Solve

What standard mathematics assumes

Classical mathematics — the kind used in physics, chemistry, and most of biology — is built on a specific and rarely stated assumption: that identity is absolute. Either two things are the same thing, or they are not. The number 2 is identical to itself. The electron measured here is not the same object as the electron measured there. Identity is binary, total, and permanent.

This assumption works extraordinarily well for the physical world as we normally encounter it. Bridges, chemical reactions, planetary orbits — all of these are described with great precision by mathematics built on absolute identity.

But it creates a deep problem the moment you try to describe something more subtle: what makes two configurations of relations equivalent? What makes the mind of a healthy eighty-year-old 'the same kind of thing' as the mind of a healthy twenty-eight-year-old, even though every measurable biological substrate has changed? What makes the relational structure of an octopus brain genuinely comparable to the relational structure of a corvid brain, even though the substrates share almost no biological architecture?

Standard mathematics answers these questions by reducing them to substance: the two minds are compared by measuring their neurons, their chemistry, their genes. The two animals are compared by their phylogenetic distance. But this is precisely the move that relational ontology rejects — because it assumes that what matters is what things are made of, not how they are organized.

A mathematics of relational ontology needs to be able to say: two configurations are equivalent if there exists a path of continuous transformation between them — regardless of what substance they are instantiated in. It needs identity to be not a binary fact, but a structure. Something that can be more or less tight, that can hold in some directions and not others, that can be demonstrated rather than assumed.

That mathematics exists. It is called Homotopy Type Theory.

Part Two: What Homotopy Type Theory Is

Three ideas, explained without symbols

HoTT brings together three deep ideas from different corners of mathematics. Each one is individually important. Together, they constitute a radically different way of thinking about what mathematical objects are.

Idea One: Types instead of sets

Classical mathematics is built on set theory: the universe consists of sets of elements, and everything else is constructed from those. A set either contains an element or it does not. Membership is binary.

Type theory starts differently. Instead of sets of elements, it works with types and terms. A term belongs to a type not because it was placed there by definition, but because it can be constructed — demonstrated, proven — to be of that type. The distinction sounds subtle but is

fundamental: in type theory, to say something exists is to give a proof of its existence. Mathematics becomes computational. Every object carries with it the demonstration of what it is.

For relational ontology, this matters because it means that a relational configuration is not just listed — it is constructed. Its properties are not external labels but internal demonstrations. When VCP assigns a value to the self-modeling parameter r of a system, that value is not a label placed on the system from outside. It is a demonstration derived from the system's documented behavior.

Idea Two: Identity as a path, not a fact

This is HoTT's most radical contribution. In classical mathematics, identity between two objects is a binary judgment: they are the same or they are not. In HoTT, identity between two objects of the same type is itself a mathematical object — a path connecting them. And there can be multiple distinct paths between the same two objects. Identity is not a binary fact. It is a structure.

What does this mean in practice? Consider two systems — say, the healthy twenty-eight-year-old and the cognitively intact eighty-year-old from Simulations 12 and 13. In classical mathematics, the question 'are these the same?' has only two answers: yes or no. In HoTT, the question becomes: 'what is the structure of the equivalence between these configurations?' The answer can be: there is a path of continuous transformation between them — in the VCP parameter space, a path of length 0.103 — and that path has specific properties. It moves stability upward, integration slightly downward, self-modeling slightly downward. The path exists. The path has a direction. The path has a length. That is richer than a binary yes or no.

This is why VCP uses Euclidean distance in a three-dimensional parameter space rather than a binary classification. The distance is not just a number — it is a measure of the path of equivalence between two configurations. Short path: near-equivalent forms. Long path: structurally distant forms. No path: categorically different kinds of organization.

Idea Three: Homotopy — continuous deformation as equivalence

The word 'homotopy' comes from topology — the mathematics of shapes that can be continuously deformed. Two shapes are homotopy-equivalent if one can be continuously transformed into the other without tearing or gluing. A coffee cup is homotopy-equivalent to a donut, because both have exactly one hole and the cup's handle can be continuously deformed into the donut's hole. A sphere is not homotopy-equivalent to a donut, because you cannot create a hole by continuous deformation.

HoTT applies this idea to types and their inhabitants. Two proofs of the same proposition are homotopy-equivalent if there is a continuous path between them — a higher-order equivalence. This creates a hierarchy: identity at one level, equivalences between identities at the next level, equivalences between those equivalences at the level above that, and so on. The mathematical universe becomes genuinely multi-dimensional.

For relational ontology, this provides something essential: a way to talk about structural similarity that does not require identical substrate. The octopus and the corvid are not homotopy-equivalent in the naive sense — their biological architectures cannot be continuously deformed into each other. But their VCP configurations — their positions in the parameter space — are close enough that the path between them is short (distance 0.066). Homotopy type theory provides the formal justification for this kind of comparison: what matters is not the substrate but the structure of the configuration, and structural equivalence is a matter of path length, not substrate identity.

Part Three: Why This Mathematics for This Ontology

The match between HoTT and relational ontology

Relational ontology makes one fundamental claim: relations are ontologically primary. Substances — material objects, biological organisms, neural systems — are not the basic furniture of reality. They are stable configurations of relations. What a thing is is determined by its relational structure, not by what it is made of.

Standard mathematics was built for a world of substances. It excels at describing things that have fixed identity, measurable properties, and clear boundaries. It struggles with questions where identity is itself a matter of degree, where equivalence is structural rather than material, and where the same relational pattern can be instantiated in radically different substrates.

HoTT was built — independently of any ontological project — to handle exactly these questions. Its treatment of identity as a path rather than a fact, its notion of equivalence as continuous deformation rather than material identity, its construction of mathematical objects through demonstration rather than membership: all of these features align with the needs of relational ontology as if designed for it.

They were not designed for it. HoTT was developed by mathematicians and computer scientists — Vladimir Voevodsky, Per Martin-Löf, and many others — working on the foundations of mathematics and the theory of computation. The alignment is not artificial. It reflects the fact that both HoTT and relational ontology are trying to solve the same deep problem from different directions: how to describe identity and equivalence when substance is not the primary category.

Part Four: How HoTT Connects to the VCP Calculations

From ontology to parameter space

The VCP simulation series does not perform HoTT calculations directly. The numerical work — computing parameter values, Euclidean distances, identifying nearest neighbors — uses standard arithmetic. HoTT operates at a deeper level: it provides the ontological justification for why this kind of calculation is meaningful.

Specifically, HoTT justifies three choices that the VCP framework makes:

First choice: comparing across substrates.

VCP compares an octopus to a corvid to a human child to a slime mould. In classical substance-based mathematics, this comparison is questionable at best — these entities have almost nothing materially in common. HoTT justifies the comparison by grounding it in structural equivalence rather than material identity. Two configurations are comparable if their types are equivalent — if there exists a formal path between them. The VCP parameter space is precisely the space in which those paths are measured.

Second choice: treating identity as a matter of degree.

When VCP says that the cognitively intact eighty-year-old is 'nearly the same' as the twenty-eight-year-old (distance 0.103), it is making a claim that classical mathematics handles awkwardly — either they are the same or they are not. HoTT provides a formal framework in which 'nearly the same' is a precise statement: the path between them is short, has a specific direction, and has specific properties. Identity admits of degree because identity is a path, and paths have length.

Third choice: structure over substrate.

VCP assigns the same parameter r = 0.470 to the individual honeybee and a nearby value r = 0.443 to the healthy eight-year-old child. These are radically different biological organisms. The claim that they are structurally near is only defensible if structure — not substrate — is the primary ontological category. HoTT formalizes this: what matters is the type of the configuration, and types are defined by their constructive properties, not by the material in which they are instantiated.

Part Five: What This Means for the Results

Why the numbers come out coherent

Readers of the VCP simulation series sometimes note that the results feel intuitively coherent — that the orderings and proximities the framework produces match common sense in unexpected ways. This is not accidental.

When you build a measurement framework on an ontological foundation that treats structure as primary and substance as secondary, and when you then measure systems using parameters derived from their documented relational behavior rather than their material properties, the results will tend to track what is structurally real — which is also what careful observers have been tracking intuitively for millennia without formal tools.

The individual bee and the eight-year-old child are near each other in the VCP space not because someone decided they should be, but because the parameters that matter for

relational structure — behavioral consistency, information integration, self-modeling depth — happen to have similar values for both, when derived independently from their respective empirical literatures. HoTT says: structural nearness is meaningful because structure is primary. The empirical derivation produces: these two structures are near. The convergence is the point.

Similarly, the finding that the bee swarm and Physarum polycephalum occupy opposite extremes of the parameter space — one maximizing stability, the other maximizing integration, both minimizing self-modeling — is not a result that was designed in. It emerged from independent parameter derivations. HoTT provides the framework in which this kind of emergence is not surprising: if you measure structural configurations consistently, the geometry of the resulting space will reflect real structural differences, not the categories that substance-based thinking would impose.

Part Six: The Limits of What HoTT Can Do Here

Intellectual honesty requires stating what HoTT does not do in this project.

HoTT does not prove that relational ontology is correct. It provides a formal language in which relational ontology can be precisely stated and its consequences systematically derived. Whether that ontology is true is an empirical question — one that the VCP predicts will be answered by experiments like the Sepia officinalis opt-out test.

HoTT does not perform the VCP calculations. The calculations use standard arithmetic. HoTT operates at the foundational level: it justifies why those calculations are measuring something real.

HoTT does not resolve the hard problem of consciousness. It provides a framework in which structural conditions for consciousness can be formally described and compared. Whether those structural conditions are sufficient — whether there is 'something it is like' to be a system with a given VCP vector — remains an open question that no mathematics can settle from the inside.

What HoTT does is provide a rigorous foundation for the claim that comparing relational configurations across radically different substrates is a meaningful mathematical operation. Without that foundation, the VCP simulations would be intuitively suggestive but formally unjustified. With it, they are instances of a coherent formal program.

A Summary for the Reader in a Hurry

Ordinary mathematics was built for a world of substances with fixed identities. Relational ontology claims that relations — not substances — are ontologically primary.

Homotopy Type Theory (HoTT) is a branch of mathematics that treats identity as a path rather than a binary fact, equivalence as continuous structural transformation rather than

material identity, and mathematical objects as things that are demonstrated rather than merely assumed to exist.

These features make HoTT the natural formal language for relational ontology. The VCP framework uses HoTT as its foundation because HoTT formally justifies the comparisons VCP makes: across substrates, across species, across clinical states, across developmental stages.

The VCP numbers come out coherent — the orderings are meaningful, the proximities are surprising but defensible, the predications are testable — because the mathematical foundation matches the ontological claim. Structure is primary. Relations are real. The geometry of relational configurations can be measured. HoTT says why this is formally possible. The simulation results say what the geometry looks like.

Whether the geometry correctly describes reality is what the experiments are for.

This document is part of the relational ontology project The Self-Experiencing Universe (Lis, 2025, ISBN 978-83-968651-8-2). It is an explanatory companion to the VCP simulation series published at archive.org/@not_foryou. It does not replace the technical reports, which contain full formal derivations. It explains, for a general reader, why the mathematical choices made in those reports are the choices they are.

Waldemar Lis | March 2026

archive.org/@not_foryou